

Proposed Vancouver-Sea Island Tunnel

time will come in the not too distant future when Sea island will be almost completely of an airport nature, either a civil international airport, which it is today, or tied in with the R.C.A.F. Some 3,000 people reside there at the present time, as I believe the hon. member said. That number will undoubtedly not increase; perhaps it will decrease. Therefore on the basis of the hon. member's presentation we now have before us for consideration an access road from the city of Vancouver to what is going to be wholly or solely an airport area.

I certainly agree with and support the idea of a tunnel which I believe will cut off a distance of almost two miles and thus reduce travelling time if you go over the Oak street bridge and the Moray channel, or about three and a half miles if you go over the Fraser river bridge and then over the Moray channel bridge. But if the intention behind this resolution is to provide airport access, I cannot see the necessity for a four lane tunnel. For that purpose I think two lanes would be sufficient under all circumstances, unless of course the idea is that there would not only be access from the city of Vancouver with its hundreds of thousands of people, but also access over the Moray channel bridge into Lulu island, through Lulu island and via Deas island tunnel into Ladner and then to the international border. If that is the idea, then most certainly it should be a four lane tunnel.

But that brings in the fact that we have this new Oak street bridge, which is a four lane bridge and feeds not only the airport but Lulu island, Ladner and south through to the international border, where they will be completing, I think this year, perhaps one of the most modern highways in Canada.

I am from Vancouver and I will support anything that is in the interests of Vancouver; but I believe this matter is of such importance that it just cannot be discussed or concluded on the basis of one bridge, one tunnel or one purpose, excellent as that may be. I believe that when we are asking for this amount of federal money to be spent, it should be on the over-all picture of Vancouver, Burnaby, New Westminster, the Fraser valley, Richmond, Lulu island, Sea island, the airport, freeways and highways. My hon. friend's estimate, which I think is low, is \$11 million to serve an airport where we are going to build a \$22 million air service station.

I believe that the interests of the hon. member's constituency, the constituency of my hon. friend on my right from Burnaby-Coquitlam and all hon. members from Vancouver, New Westminster and the Fraser valley, would best be served—although I believe this to be an excellent idea in principle

[Mr. Winch.]

—by tying this scheme in with federal assistance in connection with an over-all transportation plan for metropolitan Vancouver, and the first money to be spent should be where the engineers say it is going to do the most good.

Mr. W. A. McLennan (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution I want to congratulate the hon. member from Burnaby-Richmond for bringing it forward. I think that with such an important international airport as we have on Sea island it is rather incredible that we have only one access to it, and actually not a direct one at that.

We have seen many cases of swing spans such as that which crosses over the Moray channel from Lulu island to Sea island getting stuck, being hit by a barge or developing some mechanical failure, and if that should happen it could take several hours to repair.

I support wholeheartedly the resolution my hon. friend has introduced. I am not going to speak on it at great length and go over the details which have already been given to this house, but I can assure the hon. member that it is a credit to him to bring in a resolution of this kind, and it has my wholehearted support.

Mr. M. D. Morton (Davenport): Mr. Speaker, it is with some trepidation that I as a member from the central or eastern part of Canada, however it may be designated, rise to become involved in a friendly discussion among hon. members from Vancouver island. I employ as a precedent the intervention of the hon. member for Laurier who pointed out that the principle involved concerns other than merely hon. members from Vancouver city.

It will be recalled that last year a request was made on behalf of the city of Toronto for assistance in constructing the Toronto subway. I believe the federal government was also approached by the city of Montreal concerning assistance for the proposed subway in that municipality. These requests would come under what the hon. member for Laurier designated as assistance for the construction of transportation facilities across Canada.

Although I do not know the details of the problem that was so ably presented here this afternoon, the discussion of this notice of motion raises a burning question that is facing all municipalities. This question comes about by the rapid growth of our municipalities and the problem they face because of the huge capital expenditures created by the need of transportation facilities, sewage facilities and other construction requirements to provide the amenities we wish to enjoy. The questions raised are: How can this construction be financed within the limited budgets of the